UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,404	11/24/2003	Christopher Hyland	LOT920030068US1 (022)	4110

46321   7590   05/28/2008
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP
STEVEN M. GREENBERG
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE
SUITE 3020
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER
HILLERY, NATHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/720,404
Filing Date: November 24, 2003
Appellant(s): HYLAND ET AL.

_____

Steven M. Greenberg
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 3/11/08 appealing from the Office action

mailed 10/11/07.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

20020165936	Alston et al.	2002
20020049749	Helgeson et al.	2002

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Alston et al. (US 20020165936 A1), and further in view of Helgeson et al. (US

20020049749 A1).

Regarding independent claim 8, Alston et al. teach that subscribers are

presented with a list of predefined page templates from which subscribers may choose

to customize their Web sites (paragraph block 0060), which meet the limitation of

retrieving a specified template for producing a desired report;

Alston et al. teach that each predefined page template within a section is

specified by subscribers by their providing the same input and output parameters

(paragraph block 0061), which meet the limitation of **determining from said specified**

template a set of parameters required to produce said desired report;

Alston et al. teach that the process engine contains logic and rules on how

certain business services should be processed. For example, using the branding

information and configuration information defined via the administration application, the

process engine runs the underlying engine or logic to process orders, for example,

stores the order record into the appropriate database, updates the counts available, and

the like (paragraph block 0045), which meet the limitation of **for each parameter in**

said set, selecting a screen for providing a user interface through which a value

can be established for said parameter, and embedding business rule enforcement

logic in said selected screen; and,

Alston et al. teach that each site flow definition, as selected by a subscriber,

enables the e-commerce channel to maintain and determine the state of the Web page

currently being presented to a user. This is important in ensuring that a customer may

move from page to page in a subscriber's Web site without fear of loosing transactional

information. For example, certain state information concerning a customer's session

must be preserved as the customer visits pages (paragraph block 0056), which meet

the limitation of **saving each of said selected screens in a report definition**

configured to produce a report while executing said embedded business rule

enforcement logic to enforce the business rules in respect to values established

for corresponding ones of the parameters in the set.

Alston et al. do not explicitly teach **the business rule enforcement logic**

enforcing business rules for accessing data in a database.

Helgeson et al. teach that Model pages are responsible for producing an XML

representation of the content of the page. This content typically comes from executing

complex business logic (e.g., running database queries) (paragraph block 0772), which

meet the limitation of **the business rule enforcement logic enforcing business rules**

for accessing data in a database.

Because both Alston et al. and Helgeson et al. teach methods of processing business logic, it would have been obvious ton one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one method for the other to achieve the predictable result of processing business logic in order to access data in a database.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Alston et al. teach that based on the branding information supplied by the subscriber, particularly the flow, the on-demand site application knows what Web pages are to be presented to the user and in what order (paragraph block 0082), which meet the limitation of **storing an order of presentation for said selected screens in said report definition**.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Alston et al. teach that each site flow definition, as selected by a subscriber, enables the e-commerce channel to maintain and determine the state of the Web page currently being presented to a user. This is important in ensuring that a customer may move from page to page in a subscriber's Web site without fear of loosing transactional information. For example, certain state information concerning a customer's session must be preserved as the customer visits pages. The different predefined flows from which a subscriber makes selections must be programmed such that customer session state information is available for needed e-commerce processing regardless of the route used by the customer to arrive at a processing page (paragraph block 0056), which meet the limitation of **retrieving said report definition; rendering each of said selected screens in said stored order;**

**collecting parameter values for said parameters in said set through said rendered
screens while limiting said parameter values according to said embedded
business rule enforcement logic; and, generating said report based upon said
collected parameter values**.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Alston et al. teach that certain state information
concerning a customer's session (such as shopping basket information and product
searches) must be preserved as the customer visits pages. The different predefined
flows from which a subscriber makes selections must be programmed such that
customer session state information is available for needed e-commerce processing
regardless of the route used by the customer to arrive at a processing page (paragraph
block 0056), which meet the limitation of **identifying session state data through said
rendered screens; processing said session state data to limit data input through
form fields in said screens; and, accepting data input through said form fields to
establish said parameters**.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Alston et al. teach that rules, constraints, and
default values may be defined to limit the configuration combinations that may be
selected and searched by customers. Each attribute may be ranked (an "attribute
order"), as desired by the subscriber (paragraph block 0072), which meet the limitation
of **identifying an end user through said session state data; limiting a range of data
which can be accessed in said report based upon an identity of said end user as**

processed through said embedded business rule enforcement logic; and, reflecting said limited range of data through data input restrictions applied to said form fields in said screens.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Alston et al. teach that the process engine of the e-commerce channel is a set of software applications that uses the branding information and the configuration information, and other appropriate data stored in the central e-commerce channel, to handle a business service provided by the e-commerce system (paragraph block 0045), which meet the limitation of **saving said report for subsequent reuse**.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Alston et al. teach that the process engine contains logic and rules on how certain business services should be processed. For example, using the branding information and configuration information defined via the administration application, the process engine runs the underlying engine or logic to process orders, for example, stores the order record into the appropriate database, updates the counts available, and the like (paragraph block 0045), which meet the limitation of **loading said saved report; determining session state data for an end user loading said saved report; applying at least one business rule comparable to a business rule reflected in said embedded business rule enforcement logic to said session state data; and, modifying said saved report to enforce said at least one comparable business rule.**

Regarding claims 15 – 21, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 8 – 14 and re rejected along the same rationale.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant argues that Alston and Helgeson fail to teach **the business rule enforcement logic enforcing business rules for accessing data in a database** because nothing in paragraph [0772] of Helgeson suggests the "enforcement of business rules" (pp 4 and 5).

The Office disagrees.

First, appellant is not fully appreciating the references as a whole. A reference is valid for all that it teaches and appellant is simply focusing on one paragraph block of one reference.

For the sake of brevity, it should be noted that appellant does not explain how or why the claim language distinguishes from the applied references. Specifically, the position of the Office is that Helgeson teaches that Model pages are responsible for producing an XML representation of the content of the page. This content typically comes from **executing complex business logic** (e.g., running database queries, exercising business APIs, etc.).

Clearly, executing complex business logic, for example running database queries, meet the claim limitation that business rule enforcement logic enforces business rules for accessing data in a database. There is no proof or rebuttal as to how

or why the business logic of Helgeson is different. Appellant has pointed solely to the

lack of the term "enforcement" in Helegeson. However, Helgeson continues to teach

that Web Content Server 800 introduces an implementation of the Command pattern

(Gamma et al.). A developer can invoke a command from a model page by using the

execute Web Content Server 800 tag library tag.

      The skilled artisan would have interpreted the implementation and/or invocation

of a command pattern to invoke commands as enforcement especially in light of the

example taught by Helgeson :

<wdktags:execute manager="CatalogCommandMgr" command="search"/>.

      It is not understood nor has it been preferred by appellant as to how or why

Helgeson, in combination with Alston, does not teach the business rule enforcement

logic claimed by appellant despite the lack of the term "enforcement" appearing in the

reference(s).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the

Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nathan Hillery/

Examiner, Art Unit 2176

Conferees:

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100

/Rachna S Desai/
Rachna S. Desai
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176